

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7

8 SAMUEL HART,
9 Plaintiff(s),

10 v.

11 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
12 DEPARTMENT,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-0340-JAD-NJK

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

13 Plaintiff has failed to update his address. Docket No. 24. “A party, not the district court,
14 bears the burden of keeping the court apprised of any changes in [her] mailing address.” *Carey v.*
15 *King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (*per curiam*); *see also In re Hammer*, 940 F.2d 524,
16 526 (9th Cir. 1991). To that end, the local rules require that litigants immediately file written
17 notification of any change of address, and the local rules expressly warn that failure to do so may
18 result in case-dispositive sanctions. *See* Local Rule IA 3-1.

19 On July 14, 2021, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file a notice of change of address by
20 August 4, 2021. Docket No. 25. The Court expressly warned that “**FAILURE TO COMPLY**
21 **WITH THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN THE DISMISSAL OF THIS CASE.**” *Id.* at 1
22 (emphasis in original). To date, Plaintiff has failed to comply with that order.

23 Plaintiff has disobeyed the local rules and the Court’s order requiring prompt updating of
24 a litigant’s address. Plaintiff’s failure to update his address, his disobedience with the local rules,
25 and his disobedience of the Court’s order are abusive litigation practices that have interfered with
26 the Court’s ability to hear this case, delayed litigation, disrupted the Court’s timely management
27 of its docket, wasted judicial resources, and threatened the integrity of the Court’s orders and the
28 orderly administration of justice. Sanctions less drastic than dismissal are unavailable because

1 Plaintiff has refused to comply with the order of this Court notwithstanding the warning that case-
2 dispositive sanctions may be imposed. Moreover, the Court is unable to contact Plaintiff “to
3 threaten [her] with some lesser sanction [because] [a]n order to show cause why dismissal was not
4 warranted or an order imposing sanctions would only find itself taking a round trip tour through
5 the United States mail.” *Carey*, 856 F.2d at 1441.

6 Accordingly, in light of the circumstances outlined above, the undersigned
7 **RECOMMENDS** that this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

8 Dated: August 13, 2021

9
10 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

11
12 **NOTICE**

13 This report and recommendation is submitted to the United States District Judge assigned
14 to this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party who objects to this report and
15 recommendation must file a written objection supported by points and authorities within fourteen
16 days of being served with this report and recommendation. Local Rule IB 3-2(a). Failure to file
17 a timely objection may waive the right to appeal the district court’s order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951
18 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).